

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-20 are all the claims pending in the application.

### **I.      Objections to the Specification**

The Examiner has objected to the specification for the reasons set forth on page 2 of the Office Action. Applicants submit herewith a substitute specification and abstract which address the Examiner's objections and include various editorial amendments that have been made for grammatical and general readability purposes. No new matter has been added. Also enclosed is a marked-up copy of the original specification and abstract showing the changes incorporated into the substitute specification and abstract.

### **II.     Objections to the Claims**

The Examiner has objected to claim 13 for the reasons set forth on page 2 of the Office Action. Applicants have amended this claim in a manner to overcome the Examiner's objection. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the objection to the claims be reconsidered and withdrawn.

### **III.    Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph**

The Examiner has rejected claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. In particular, the Examiner has asserted that the term "small" in claim 2 renders this claim indefinite. Applicants have amended claim 2 so as to remove the term "small", and therefore, kindly request that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

#### **IV. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Matsuda et al. (U.S. 6,144,352).

Claim 1, as amended, recites the features of a main current driver operable to supply a main current to at least a blue light emitting element in a pixel, and a correcting current driver operable to add a correcting current for chromaticity correcting to at least one of a red light emitting element and a green light emitting in the pixel. Applicants respectfully submit that Matsuda fails to disclose or suggest at least these features of claim 1.

Regarding Matsuda, Applicants note that this reference discloses an LED display device which adjusts the chromaticity for a red color and a green color in order to provide improved color reproducibility (see col. 2, lines 20-28). In particular, when a signal is received instructing that only a red LED should be displayed, a red color control circuit 4 is structured so as to output a main signal for turning on a red LED and a sub signal for turning on the a green LED (see col. 5, lines 22-26). The main signal causes a red LED driving circuit 7 to turn on the red LED, and the sub signal causes a green LED driving circuit to turn on the green LED (see col. 5, lines 26-28). Thus, in response to a red color signal, both the red LED and the green LED are turned on at a predetermined ratio (see col. 5, lines 29-31).

Similarly, when a signal is received instructing that only a green LED should be displayed, a green color control circuit 5 is structured so as to output a main signal for turning on the green LED and a sub signal for turning on the red LED (see col. 5, lines 41-45). The main signal causes the green LED driving circuit 8 to turn on the green LED, and the sub signal causes the red LED driving circuit 7 to turn on the red LED (see col. 5, lines 45-47). Thus, in response

to a green color signal, both the green LED and the red LED are turned on at a predetermined ratio (see col. 5, lines 47-49).

In contrast to the operations above for providing a red color and a green color, in Matsuda, when a signal is received instructing that only a blue LED should be displayed, a blue control circuit 6 controls only the amount of blue light emitted by the blue LED (see col. 1, lines 61-64 and col. 5, lines 1-3). In other words, in Matsuda, in response to a blue color signal, only the blue LED is turned on, without any other form of compensation as described above regarding the techniques utilized to produce a red color and a green color. Thus, while Matsuda provides compensation for the output of a red LED and a green LED, Matsuda does not provide compensation for the output of a blue LED.

Accordingly, as Matsuda does not provide compensation for a blue LED, Applicants respectfully submit that Matsuda fails to disclose the features of a main current driver operable to supply a main current to at least a blue light emitting element in a pixel, and a correcting current driver operable to add a correcting current for chromaticity correcting to at least one of a red light emitting element and a green light emitting in the pixel, as recited in amended claim 1.

Further, as Matsuda specifically teaches that no form of compensation is required when turning on a blue LED, Applicants respectfully submit that one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to modify Matsuda to provide such features.

In addition, Applicants note that claim 1 also recites that the main current and the correcting current are controlled by a pulse driving period. In the Office Action, the Examiner has indicated that col. 6, lines 10-44 of Matsuda discloses the above-noted feature. Applicants respectfully disagree.

In particular, Applicants note that while col. 6, lines 10-44 of Matsuda indicates that color signals are amplified, there is no indication whatsoever that a main current and a correcting current are controlled by a pulse driving period, as recited in claim 1.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable over Matsuda, an indication of which is respectfully requested. Claims 2-10 and 15-20 depend from claim 1 and are therefore considered patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

Regarding claim 11, Applicants note that this claim recites the features of a plurality of light emitting elements corresponding to a red color tone, a green color tone and a blue color tone (R, G, B) disposed in each pixel, wherein, in light emission of each light emitting element, an amount of light emission is controlled so as to add an amount of light emission of at least one of the other light emitting elements.

Thus, according to claim 11, the light emission of each light element (which includes the light emitting element corresponding to a blue color tone) is controlled so as to add an amount of light emission of at least one of the other light emitting elements. For example, for the light emitting element corresponding to the blue color tone, the light emission is controlled so as to add an amount of light emission of at least one of the light emitting elements corresponding to the red and green color tones.

As discussed above, while Matsuda provides compensation for the output of a red LED and a green LED, Matsuda does not provide compensation for the output of a blue LED. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Matsuda does not disclose or suggest that in light emission of each light emitting element, an amount of light emission is controlled so as to

add an amount of light emission of at least one of the other light emitting elements, as recited in claim 11.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that Matsuda does not disclose, suggest or otherwise render obvious all of the features recited in claim 11. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 11 is patentable over the cited prior art, an indication of which is kindly requested. Claim 12 depends from claim 11 and is therefore considered patentable at least by virtue of its dependency.

Regarding claim 13, Applicants note that this claim has been amended to recite the features of supplying a main current to a blue light emitting element in a pixel, and adding a correcting current for chromaticity correcting to at least one of a red light emitting element and a green light emitting element in the pixel.

For at least similar reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that Matsuda does not disclose, suggest or otherwise render obvious such features. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 13 is patentable over the cited prior art, an indication of which is kindly requested.

Regarding claim 14, Applicants note that this claim is drawn to a control method for a display apparatus having a plurality of light emitting elements corresponding to a red color tone, a green color tone and a blue color tone (R, G, B) disposed in each pixel, wherein, in light emission of each light emitting element, controlling an amount of light emission so as to add an amount of light emission of at least one of the other light emitting elements.

For at least similar reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 11, Applicants respectfully submit that Matsuda does not disclose, suggest or otherwise render obvious such

features. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 14 is patentable over the cited prior art, an indication of which is kindly requested.

## **V. Conclusion**

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may best be resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Yoshifumi NAGAI et al.

By: Kenneth W. Fields  
Kenneth W. Fields  
Registration No. 52,430  
Attorney for Applicants

KWF/tnt  
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021  
Telephone (202) 721-8200  
Facsimile (202) 721-8250  
June 14, 2006